## REMARKS

Claims 1, 4, 6 and 9 are amended. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Regarding the 35 USC 112 first paragraph rejections, the term "single field" recited in the independent claims finds specific support at lines 17-20 of specification page 10. As explained there, "extension portions specify packet group continues". first extension portion defines a "new field packet for the packet a second extension portion defines continuation packet." This concept is also described at lines 16-26 of specification page 23. This page was misidentified in Applicant's previous amendment. In particular, the aforementioned extension portion that defines a "new field packet" is described (at lines 16-17 of page 23) as defining the first packet of a packet subgroup. Similarly, the aforementioned extension portion that defines a "field continuation packet" is described (at lines 18-19 of page 23) as defining a continuation packet. The abovenoted description of a "new field packet" and a "field continuation packet" is thus readily seen to support the claim recitation that "said at least one packet subgroup constitutes a single field". Accordingly, the rejections are believed overcome.

Claim 4 as presented above is believed to overcome the 35 USC 112 second paragraph rejection.

All pending claims recite that

"a remainder of said further packets follow the first packet in said at least one packet subgroup and contain content whose essence is the same as content contained in the first packet such that said at least one packet subgroup constitutes a single field in the trace stream".

This exemplary feature is not found in the primary reference to Maes (as noted in the pending final Office Action). The remaining references of record fail to remedy this deficiency of Maes.

Further and favorable consideration is respectfully requested.

Respectfully Submitted,

SCOTT B. STAHL

Reg. No. 33,795